

June 16, 1976

"street" position he had assumed two years earlier vetoing separate bills that would delay the start of the program to have the healthy districts support the less affluent ones. He was helped by the fact that the so-called negative aid concept was to be phased in over ten years, with only nineteen of 416 school districts being immediately affected.

Lowering property taxes is obviously a popular issue and Lucey has exercised great budgetary ingenuity to make it possible. The budget bills he has submitted are carefully constructed, with selective taxes on some special-interest groups and new administrative procedures that have accelerated payments and thus accumulated more interest on funds held by the state. In addition, a number of state agency services that had been financed through taxes are now paid for by the imposition of, or increases in, fees. Lucey has also leaned hard on the Wisconsin office in Washington to capture more federal dollars. At the same time, he has channeled all federal revenue-sharing funds into the new school-aid formula, thus lightening property taxes. He has threatened to reduce the school-aid formula next year if revenue sharing is not continued by the Congress; this puts pressure on the Wisconsin Congressional delegation to battle for extension of the program.

The tax concessions to industry are remarkable in a state where it had been assumed that Democratic Governors were not particularly friendly to the business community. But Lucey—a fiscally conservative Governor when he has to be—saw the advantages of increasing the state's revenue base; at the same time, he helped convince union leaders that business improvements meant more jobs in a period of recession. When Lucey encouraged Republican legislators to take the lead on the proposal, the changes sailed through. Representatives of units of government that lost revenues when the industrial tax base was lowered were too late in their opposition.

Another Lucey approach is to take over some legislation, initiated outside his office, which he feels is needed. He convinces his legislative allies of his interest, promotes the legislation at every opportunity in appearances throughout the state and, when the bills require compromise between opposing interests, insures that his position is known. Democratic legislators took the lead on the power plant and campaign finance reform bills. When opposition developed, they met with opponents to work out compromise legislation. During these negotiations, Lucey's aides were at the legislative elbows, constantly transmitting his views, pro and con, on various provisions. And Lucey spoke publicly on the need to balance future energy needs against possible damage to the environment and appealing to concerns raised by the then recent activities of the Committee to Re-Elect the President.

That approach was evident also in the Wisconsin Consumer Act—the product of intensive negotiations between consumer groups, financial institutions and legislators for more than a year. In the end, Lucey's legal counsel was a key figure in developing legislation which became a model for other states.

The Governor, for the most part, has conducted an open administration, so it was natural for him to support such bills as a tougher open meeting law, the code of ethics and the broadening of voter registration. He was among the early leaders in the call for more responsiveness on the part of government at all levels.

Lucey's success with legislation stems largely from his mastery of various political techniques and his usually perceptive reading of the public mood. He has, in effect, a political tool box from which he draws the specific device for the specific issue. But even

more, his success stems from the personal characteristics he brings to the executive office. Few, if any, of his predecessors have attacked the job with as high a degree of intellectual curiosity and hard work. Lucey, now 58, is no back-slapper or partygoer, nor is he much interested in the ceremonial trappings of office. He is a quiet man, impelled by an urge to succeed in whatever he does and is committed to learning all he can about the operation of state government. It may be relevant that his academic degree is in philosophy, not business or political science, but he was also a successful real estate man before seeking public office.

He turned to state party work in the late 1940s, helping to bring the Democratic Party out of a decline, slogging through heavy organizational work and fund raising. He became a dominant, forceful party chairman in the last 1950s, when Democratic candidates began surging into command of the state (both U.S. Senators; seven of nine U.S. Representatives; control of all state constitutional offices and a majority in both houses of the legislature by 1975). He was a state Assemblyman in 1949, lost a race for Congress in 1950, served as lieutenant governor under his GOP predecessor, Warren P. Knowles.

Lucey has called legislators into special sessions more times than any Governor in state history. He loads budget bills with nonbudgetary matters to the point where they creak with the weight. He makes personal appearances at legislative caucuses. He dangles judicial and administrative appointments before eager legislators. He has made a science of the partial veto, getting what he wants by eliminating phrases, words, or even numbers. He once infuriated a Republican attorney general by striking the "2" from a \$25 million appropriation. Lucey, contending he still was right, nevertheless backed off.

His dealings with the state civil service and administrative agencies have been equally aggressive; he insists on increased productivity, a revision of traditional civil service procedures. And, of course, he installs as department heads men and women who share his views.

All of this brings complaints that he is ruthless, scheming, vindictive and a political boss type in a state which has a tradition of no patronage and a repugnance toward political machines. But his friends and foes agree that he is unusually courageous in pushing through his positions, even though it means tackling some of the most powerful lobbyists and special-interest groups in the state.

That quality, plus his years as a demanding, controversial party chairman, has created an impression in the general public that he is a wheeler-dealer, grasping politician. But Lucey offsets this judgment somewhat by his accomplishments and his sensitive appraisal of what the public wants and needs.

He is also lucky to be the first Governor elected to a four-year term in the history of the state. To his credit he saw the advantages and used them, taking the time to get things done, rather than concentrating from the start on re-election. He took office when the economy was strong and the state had a healthy surplus of funds, but he knew how to economize when the slump came and has helped the state retain its top credit rating in the bond market.

He became Governor when civil unrest had abated on the campuses and in the big cities, and he was not harassed by the need to extinguish fires. He has worked from the start with Democratic Assemblies and in 1974 the Senate became Democratic for the first time in this century. His two Republican opponents for governor have been relatively lackluster and Lucey won by margins of more than 181,000 and 160,000 votes.

That Lucey can fail is evident in the defeat of the transportation bill. In that case, it appears, that he was too far out in front of the people—warning of the dire consequences of letting roads and bridges deteriorate, rail service wither away and city bus systems operate with serious deficits. Appeals to conserve fuel and save the environment by placing less reliance on automobiles met resistance from a car-conditioned society. A split between rural and urban legislators and the proposals to raise additional revenues from heavier fees on vehicles (as the legislature neared an election year) combined to send the bill down to defeat.

He has not succeeded in getting all the reforms that he wants in the prison and welfare systems; he has not managed to put controls on health-care costs; he supports, but has not gotten, a no-fault auto insurance system; and the state has not moved toward the land use and other environmental measures that Lucey backs.

Increasingly, Wisconsin thinks that Lucey will try for a third term, but that may depend on what happens in the Presidential election this year. It will not be easy: Lucey has made enemies and twelve years in office is unprecedented for a Governor of this state (indeed, eight years is unprecedented). However, given his record, the job's still not finished, and his intense drive to be a dominant figure in Wisconsin politics, Lucey will probably accept the challenge.

CORPORATE BRIBERY AND KICKBACKS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I rise to welcome President Ford, however belatedly, to the ranks of those who have been concerned with the problem of corporate bribery and kickbacks and its cousin, the problem of corporate political involvement abroad.

President Ford's three major themes are ones to which exception cannot be taken. The problem is, as he says, serious, and legislation is imperative. American society cannot, as he says, accept corporations which keep false books and systematically mislead their accountants. Finally, international agreement is, as he says, necessary to solve the problem.

Alas, the major themes find little support in the detail of the President's proposals. To understand why requires a careful look with an eye to who will enforce the law and to whom disclosure will be made. After looking, I believe President Ford is not serious and is trying to paper over the problem.

The remedies we create must be enforceable and enforced. If there is any question about our resolve and the willingness of this Government to catch and punish the lawbreakers, the ensuing cynicism will further erode confidence in the free enterprise system.

The one agency which has tried to solve the problem of corporate payoff and improper accounting is the Securities and Exchange Commission. Of all the agencies working on the problem, it alone has the expertise and the skill to enforce whatever standards we set. The Presidential proposals appear on their face to take the question of enforcement from the SEC and place it in the hands of the State Department which has no enforcement capacity or experience. Any antipayoff law with the State Department as watchdog will be a voluntary proposition.

Our proposal, S. 3379, calls for SEC enforcement with a report on the findings to be given to the State Department for assessment of the foreign policy impact. We believe the corporate community will take the SEC seriously on these matters.

The President's proposal also suggests that the State Department has the option of burying the information on payoffs for foreign policy reasons if it deems it sensitive. If it had been up to the Department of State, none of the current specific disclosures about corporate malingerings would have been made. State's interest is in not rocking the boat. By its very nature, law enforcement rocks the boat. If disclosure is to be a serious deterrent, it must go to all the relevant law enforcement agencies and to the Congress. That distribution will insure that companies will not risk impropriety.

A generalized negotiation in the United Nations is the last place to go for an international bribery convention. A general discussion in the U.N. will quickly bog down in a morass of peripheral issues and in the more general debate over the distribution of wealth and resources.

The two places for serious action are the OECD—organization for Economic Cooperation and Development—and in our bilateral relations with Switzerland. Virtually all of the multinationals which have been involved in payoffs are headquartered in OECD countries or depend on OECD markets. Agreement among these countries is possible. It can be enforced. When the subcommittee staff discussed the prospects in Paris several months ago, the consensus was that a strong American initiative for an agreement would get support, and it was realistic to expect more than hortatory language.

The Swiss problem is a bilateral one. American companies have used Switzerland as a convenient place to hide their dubious transactions. The Swiss combination of bank secrecy, the prohibition against allowing foreign government agents to investigate their own nationals in Switzerland and the law which prohibits compliance with a subpoena—if the company does not want to comply with it—have made the country a natural hiding place. In my judgment the Swiss are willing to discuss these issues reasonably, and we should immediately press for a broadening of the recently signed Judicial Assistance Treaty. If negotiation fails, we should consider legislation which would sharply limit the ability of American companies to do business using Switzerland as a base.

Mr. President, I was certain that the White House, along with all of us, would favor honesty. I confess to being somewhat surprised by how long it took the White House to make up its mind, and I am more than a little disappointed in the lack of teeth in its proposal.

I would hope that those of my colleagues who were impressed with the administration's statement of faith would look at the actions proposed to back it up. They are mighty thin.

THE NEED FOR CLIMATE RESEARCH

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Public Affairs Research Organization, Inc., has prepared a study entitled "Climate Research: An Urgent Priority" which aptly discusses the need for additional climate research. I have long been concerned about the agricultural production capabilities of this country, and every year, despite our technological advances and Government incentive programs, the weather always has the largest impact on the size of the harvest. Actually, we have been lucky. The weather during the first part of this century has been the most favorable for agricultural production out of the last 1,000 years.

The authors of this study, Richard S. Morris and David Lenefsky, discuss the historical changes in climate and the effect of pollution on climate change. Noting the work of Dr. Reid Bryson, director of the Institute for Environmental Studies at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, they comment:

The trend over the past century has been to create about 17 percent of the Arctic temperature variance due to man-generated particulate emissions, with the ratio recently rising to about 30 percent, the remainder due to volcanic activity.

Morris and Lenefsky suggest that a higher priority in climate research should be given to climate modeling and obtaining more comprehensive and accurate statistical data so that the prediction of climate a year in advance might become possible.

The authors suggest that increased funding for climate research through both the Office of Climate Dynamics of the National Science Foundation and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, in combination with the following elements of a climate program, would provide the basis for a fruitful attempt to better understand the climate. These elements are:

A focus on causality with the special emphasis on the extent of human impact;

An interdisciplinary model of climate change which translates obtainable raw data into bottom line food production predictions and actionable proposals for accommodation of such production limitations; and

The development of predictability of climate variations by region on a season-in-advance basis, with such focus as would permit the alteration of plantings in particular parts of the globe to take account of such input.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this study be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the study was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CLIMATE RESEARCH: AN URGENT PRIORITY

(By Richard S. Morris and David Lenefsky)

As mankind begins to lose the race between population growth and food supply, the changing pattern of our climate must become an increasingly pressing concern. Few pieces of news loom as seriously for a

world faced with a need to increase food supply by two and one-half times by the year 2000 to keep pace with population and consumption growth, than that world climate has taken a sharp turn for the worse.

The first half of the twentieth century was the best period for food production in the last 1,000 years, but our luck is fading. Due to a global cooling trend in progress since 1945, we are beginning to face severe disruptions in agriculturally favorable weather, particularly in the monsoon regions of the world—where overpopulation is most acute.

Six years of drought in the Sahelian or sub-Saharan countries, the unusual droughts in Russia, Central America, West Africa, Australia, and South Asia in 1977 and poor weather conditions in much of 1974, are indicators of this adverse trend in climate.

To date, we have tended to look at weather problems in terms both of day-to-day forecasting and of long range statistical trends. We tend to track climate rather than understand it, observe it rather than grasp it. Our approach fails to inter-relate the various disciplines concerned with climate and its impact. The climate expert traces observed weather patterns, the food production expert examines the requisites for food generation, the socioeconomist traces the economies of agriculture in developing nations, the geographer focuses on analysis of geographic influences of climate, the environmentalist monitors emissions, but neither communicate across academic lines.

No ongoing effort is made, except in isolated circumstances, to co-relate the findings of the climate expert on likely rainfall patterns with those of the food production expert on the various needs of different crops for rain with those of the socioeconomist on the likely agricultural habits of the impacted areas nor with the geographer in the likely crop patterns in each area. Neither are the findings of the climate expert related to the researches of the environmental expert, despite ample proof that man is altering his climate by his environmental emissions.

Neither is climate research accorded a high priority. Annual appropriations are small and often poorly directed. Agencies overlap in jurisdiction and too little coordination is evident.

This paper examines these issues and recommends alternatives for coping with the problem.

CHANGING CLIMATE PATTERNS

The climate of the earth is highly unstable and is subject to rapid change. While some have discussed the approaching new ice age as a possible climate occurrence during the next thousand years, most have ignored the very real climate changes through which we are now progressing, which will have a key impact on food production in the immediate future.

In oversimplified terms, rainfall location is a function of wind patterns. In monsoon regions—including all of South Asia and sub-Saharan Africa—rain comes when moist air from the equatorial seas enters the continents, replacing the dry air of the anticyclone winds. These moist winds come as the anticyclones move toward the pole in the summer. The deeper the penetration of moist air, the greater the monsoon rain. The advancing edge of moist monsoon air-stream is called the intertropical discontinuity (ITD), north of which there is no rain.

As arctic temperature drops, the anticyclones remain farther southward, and the penetration of the ITD is decreased. Even slight variations in arctic temperature can create very substantial southward contain-